



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/807,319	06/04/2001	Yoshiyuki Muneno	441P066 5937		
7	590 04/23/2004		EXAMINER		
Henry C Nields			MILLER, EDWARD A		
Nields & Lema Suite 8	ick		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
176 East Main Street			3641	TAI ER NOMBER	
Westboro, MA 01581			DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
	09/807,319		MUNENO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit
	Edward A. Miller		3641
The MAILING DATE of this communication app 'eriod for Reply	ears on the cove	r sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, how within the statutory min will apply and will expire cause the application t	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from o become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).
itatus			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December</u> 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-fin	mal matters, pro	
)isposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange replacement or declaration is objected to by the Example 11).	epted or b) obj drawing(s) be held on is required if th	in abeyance. See e drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			₽
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been rece have been rece ity documents ha (PCT Rule 17.2	ived. ived in Application ive been received (a)).	on No d in this National Stage
ttachment(s)		•	•
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/18/03.	5) 🔲	Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat Notice of Informal Pa Other:	PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trademark Office			

Application/Control Number: 09/807,319

Art Unit: 3641

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear from the claim language, including as argued, whether the drying step removes all the solvent, e.g., nitromethane, or not. Thus, it is not clear what the metes and bounds of the final composition, as claimed, is.

- 3. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. I the instant situation, there does not appear to be any description of whether the drying step removes all the solvent, e.g., the nitromethane. There does not appear to be any water in the composition, or anything else that would be removed by drying, except the nitromethane solvent. Since something is removed by drying, as taught and argued by applicants, it is not clear what this can be other than the solvent. Thus, the invention is not described in such a way as to disclose the invention, or in such a way as to enable those of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention.
- 4. Claims 2-6, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardy in view of Swotinsky et al., and further in view of Klug and Donoho, and further in view of Crawford et al., Minnick et al., and Machacek.

Bernardy teaches pyrotechnics of color salts and a nitrocellulose binder. Substitution of a similar nitrocellulose binder containing nitro-compounds would have been obvious in view of

Art Unit: 3641

Swotinsky et al, who teach that such are notoriously well known. The form of claim 6 is admitted old by applicants in their specification. To the extent appropriate, substitution of a nitrocellulose gel as binder as taught in Klug and Donoho would have been obvious. The further in view of references, Crawford et al., Minnick et al., and Machacek, further show nitrocellulose gel including nitrocellulose and nitromethane, compared with other known solvents to make the gel or lacquer. These are only as the claims are understood. It is well settled that optimizing a result effective variable is well within the expected ability of a person or ordinary skill in the subject art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980), *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning either this or an earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Edward A. Miller at (703) 306-4163. Examiner Miller may normally be reached Monday-Thursday, from 10 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach Examiner Miller by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor Mr. Carone can be reached at (703) 306-4198.

If there is no answer, or for any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the application status, please call the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1113.

Miller/em April 19, 2004

> EDWARD A. MILLEH PRIMARY EXAMINER